

1

5

0

15

20

1 Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended herein consistent
with the interview. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in
condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of
the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned
5 attorney to resolve the issues.

Claim Objections

Claims 42-44 are objected to for a typographical error in the claim
dependency. Appropriate correction to these claims has been made herein.
10 Accordingly, the claim objections have been obviated.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being
indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject
15 matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, Examiner indicates
lack of antecedent basis for “the ‘xmltoEdit’ element” in claims 41-44.
Appropriate correction to these claims has been made herein. Accordingly, the
§112 rejections have been obviated.

35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

20 Claims 18-20 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being
anticipated by Kutay et al., US 2002/0026461 (herein “Kutay”).

1 Claims 21, 24, 29-30, 35-41 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kutay.

 Claims 22-23, 31-34 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kutay as applied to Claim 18 above, and further in view of Britton et al., US 2003/0018668, (herein “Britton”).

 Claims 25 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kutay as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Huang, US 2004/0205592 (herein “Huang”)

 Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kutay as applied to Claim 18 above, and further in view of Engel, US 2004/0163041 (herein “Engel”). The Examiner appears to have intended a rejection of claim 26 based on this proposed combination. Clarification is respectfully requested in the event that the rejection is maintained.

 Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, each of the independent claims 18 and 41 are amended herein to further clarify claimed features. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed and examples of which include at least p.5, lines 5-18; p. 13, line 13 to p. 14, line 10; and FIGS. 2, 4 and 6-9.

 In light of the above noted amendments, Applicant submits that the references of record, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of the claims as amended. As was discussed in the interview, the

1 references of record, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the
subject matter of the claims as presently recited. Accordingly, withdrawal of the
§102 and §103 rejections is respectfully requested.

5
Conclusion

The Application is in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully
requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue
remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is
10 requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/9/07

By: /Daniel T. McGinnity, #55,444/

Daniel T. McGinnity

Reg. No. 55444

Attorney for Applicant

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, PS

422 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 424

Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: (509) 755-7257

Facsimile: (509) 755-7252